

my opinion, and I think the opinion of most Members of this House, that should have been adopted by the President. If we have the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] oversee the President with the 7-year commitment, I am sure we could adopt that, and we could have the President join us in it.

The balanced budget amendment should be something unanimous. There is no one in this Chamber who is for an unbalanced budget. So I hope we will follow the guidance of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] when he says, let us get the President to the table, let us get it resolved, and for the benefit of all Americans, let us adopt the balanced budget amendment.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], the distinguished chairman of the Republican Policy Committee.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out several times in the course of this debate, the President came to the well of this House and told us in his 1993 message that it was time to stop relying on White House rosy estimates, and it was time to rely on the trustworthy estimates of the Congressional Budget Office. He got a standing ovation from the Democratic side of the aisle. We are asking him to keep that promise.

It has been pointed out by some, by one of our colleagues in debate yesterday that, well, that was when the Congressional Budget Office was on our Democratic payroll. However, we have to keep in mind that the Balanced Budget Act that we are going to be considering, one that we already voted on yesterday and that we hope comes back to us from the Senate, is based on the estimates of the Congressional Budget Office, made under the direction of Robert Reischauer, who was the Democrats' appointee to head the CBO. June O'Neill did not come on to run the CBO until afterward.

These are the Democratic staff estimates at the CBO. All that happened in the August update under June O'Neill was to move those estimates slightly closer to what the White House had, so the White House is not going to be complaining about that.

There is a videotape that some of my colleagues may have seen that collects all of President Clinton's statements on how long it should take to balance the budget, back to back to back to back, all of his statements, starting with his appearance on the "Larry King Show" when he said, I am going to present a plan to the American people to balance the budget in 5 years.

Then he says, 7 years is the right period of time. Then 9 years, most recently 10 years, and then back between 7 and 9. Then he said 10 years and presented a plan to balance the budget in 10 years that, in fact, according to CBO, did not.

It is time for the President, who most recently now has said he will veto any 7-year budget, then even later said,

maybe we will talk about it, to decide this question.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding time to me.

I think the American public is a little tired of the Government chasing its tail, and I think we have started debate a little early, but I think that is really what it is going to be about over the next 7 years as we come to struggle with what is going to be inside that budget in 7 years.

It is that one phrase that the gentleman from Maryland brought up, I think, that bothers the American public so much. The options to go beyond 7 years. I know that the freshman class that I am a member of is very hard and fast on 7 years.

How many votes have come up in the last 20 years about the balanced budget? How many times has this body voted on a balanced budget? Many, many times. The real issue is, can we do it? Do we have the discipline? Everybody wants to say, yes, we do.

Well, let us put it in writing. Let us live by it. Let us negotiate the terms, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] said. Let us negotiate the terms of what is going to happen inside that balanced budget. But let us make a hard and fast rule, 7 years, let us draw a line and say, we can do it, and let us just argue about what is inside. I think that is what the American public wants, and I think that is certainly what the freshman class wants is a 7-year plan to balance the budget.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER], the distinguished chairman of the Republican conference.

Mr. BOEHNER. Good morning to all my colleagues on this great Saturday morning, and I see the debate about balancing the budget continues to go on.

Yesterday, I think that the House and the Senate both proved to the American people that we can, in fact, balance the budget in 7 years. We did it. We brought the documents here, we laid them out, we had a great debate, and they passed on both Houses.

This issue over CBO numbers and OMB numbers, this is not just about numbers, it is about the fact that the President wants to spend \$875 billion more over the next 7 years than what we want to spend.

Mr. Speaker, if we can balance the budget in 7 years, which we proved yesterday, it is all about whether we are going to spend more of our children's inheritance, whether we are going to snatch more of the American dream away from our children, or whether we are going to stick to real numbers, certified by CBO; or whether we are going to do the same thing the politicians in this town have done for 30 years. And that is, just kind of mush the numbers together, make them work, and sell out our children.

We are not going to do that.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of our time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER], a dynamic and distinguished new Member.

(Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I stand in support of this rule, because this rule is exactly why we are here. We are here because the American people sent us to do what every American family does, and that is to live within our means and to balance the budget. Republicans and a growing number of moderate and conservative Democrats agree, it is time to balance the budget.

Who stands in the way? The limousine liberals, the tax-and-spend Democrats oppose a plan to balance the budget.

We have a plan to balance the budget in a responsible fashion over the next 7 years.

By the way, we increase spending on Medicare by 54 percent, \$355 billion over the next 7 years. We reform welfare and emphasize work; we provide tax relief to working families.

Mr. Speaker, the telephone calls that I am receiving in my offices are nine-to-one in favor of balancing the budget and holding firm. Mike and Kay Shostic of Manhattan, IL, they say, hang tough. They have three kids who are counting on the Congress to balance the budget.

I say to my colleagues, it is time to get the job done. Let us balance the budget; let us work together.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Laundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2126) "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 1058) "An Act to reform Federal securities litigation, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DODD, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. BRYAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE
RULES

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up H. Res. 275 and ask for its immediate consideration.

H. RES. 2175

Resolved, That it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of Saturday, November 18, 1995, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules: *Provided*, That the object of any motion to suspend the rules is announced from the House floor at least one hour prior to its consideration. The Speaker, or his designee shall consult with the minority leader or his designee on any matter designated for consideration under this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During the consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 275 is a straightforward resolution. The proposed rule merely provides that it shall be in order, any time today, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules. The Committee on Rules agreed to an amendment offered by Mr. BEILSON, which provides that the matters to be considered under suspension will be announced from the House floor at least 1 hour prior to consideration, and that the Speaker or his designee will consult with the minority leader or his designee on any suspension considered under this resolution. House Resolution 275 was reported out of the Committee on Rules by unanimous voice vote. Simply put, this resolution, will allow for a special suspension of the rules day for consideration of possible selective continuing resolutions to keep vital offices open.

By passing this resolution, we are attempting to speed up the legislative process so that we can reopen the Government as soon as possible while keeping our commitment to the American people to balance the Federal budget within 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Colorado for yielding me the customary half hour and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see this rule come to the floor today.

This rule permits the majority to call up suspension measures with proper notice. I assume they will use this to call up a targeted continuing resolution. I hope it will also be used to call up a governmentwide continuing resolution that the President will sign.

This rule means that Federal employees can finally get back to work; it

means that the U.S. Government will be open for business again as it should be.

It is a good rule, it is a good idea, it is just a shame it took so long; the American people expect more from their Congress and they are right.

The 84,000 American seniors and workers should have been able to apply for Social Security and disability benefits; 600,000 American seniors should have gotten answers from the 1-800 Social Security help line; 23,000 American veterans should have been able to apply for benefits.

This should not have happened and I am glad President Clinton has taken steps to stop it.

Yesterday, by Executive order, President Clinton reopened Federal offices providing services to veterans, Social Security recipients, and Medicare recipients.

He made sure that this ridiculous Government shutdown did not hurt any more than it absolutely had to and today's rule will allow congressional Republicans to tell President Clinton he had a good idea.

Given the partisan rancor around here these days, it is nice to see we still agree on some things.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

□ 1015

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this is such a silly situation, it is very difficult to know where to start. But let simply say that what this rule is going to do is to make it possible for the House leadership to bring up an additional continuing resolution today, and my understanding of what is going to happen is that that continuing resolution will allow three additional functions of Government to continue that are now closed down.

It will expand the ability of the Social Security Administration to meet and process its work, it will expand the ability of the folks running the Medicare Program to do the same thing; and it will expand the ability of the Veterans' Administration folks to do the same thing. There is nothing wrong with any of those three actions, and I would be surprised if we do not have a unanimous vote in support of them in the House.

But the problem is that those are not the only three functions which ought to be released from their hostage situation. So when we get to the bill which this rule will allow to come forward, a bill which is going to be unamenable because it is on the Suspension Calendar, I will be asking to make a number of unanimous-consent requests to try to expand the number of Government functions which will be allowed to open.

I do not see, for instance, why Galaudet University, why that university for those kids, deaf kids, why they should be forced to close. But we have a letter indicating that they will if we do not let them out of the hostage box.

I do not see why we should not make certain that all research at the National Cancer Institute is allowed to proceed. I do not see why we should not make certain that the civilians can be brought back to work in the Pentagon so that all of the military checks can be provided on the 29th. There is some concern they will not be able to do that unless those civilian employees are brought back. I do not see why we should not open up our national parks so that American families who have spent a good deal of money on vacation plans do not have that money wasted because of this silly argument on the floor of the Congress of the United States.

So on the next bill that will be coming as a result of this rule, we will be trying to expand those functions of Government, or open up those functions of Government again. But I must say that I will be asking for a "no" vote on the previous question on the rule because I believe that what this rule ought to provide is for the continuation of another full blown CR which will allow all of the functions of Government to continue while the Congress and the President go to the table on the budget.

Again, I repeat, we have two separate problems here. We have a difference between the President and the majority in the Congress on what the outcome of those budget negotiations ought to be on the reconciliation bill that passed yesterday. The way to resolve that is to resolve it not to continue to talk about how you are going to resolve it, but simply go to the table and work out the disagreements. But the reason we need a continuing resolution is an entirely separate reason, and that is because this Congress has only passed at this point 4 of the 13 appropriation bills necessary to keep the Government open.

Mr. Panetta, the President's Chief of Staff, has just asked me by telephone to ask the Congress to send down to the White House the Legislative appropriations bill and the Treasury-Postal bill. They will sign them. That will make 6 bills out of the 13 that will have crossed the congressional finish line. But we still have the Interior bill, the Foreign Operations bill, the Veterans-HUD bill, the Defense bill, the District of Columbia bill, the Commerce-Justice-State, and the Labor-HHS bill that have not gotten through the congressional process.

The President is not holding those up. The Congress is. In most instances, it is because there is an argument between Republican Members in the House and Republican Members in the Senate, who control both bodies, about what the content of those bills ought to be.

So I would suggest the simple way is for us to simply defeat the previous question on the rule, go back and get another rule, go back and send to us another continuing resolution on the House floor so that we can open up all of Government so that we do not continue to look like a bunch of silly children who are trying to dictate what the other's negotiating position ought to be.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, all the comments the preceding speaker made over 5 minutes, I can summarize it in less than a sentence. That is, we could have avoided it all if the President of the United States would agree to balance the budget of this country in 7 years.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I know we are in a hurry, but I heard the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] say that in effect, all we are doing in this CR is to ratify what the President has already done. In fact, that is not the case. The President issued an Executive order, and I am particularly concerned in the area of the veterans, but all his Executive order did was to authorize the processing of new claims. He could not send out the checks, he argued.

We have checked with the Veterans' Administration. They argue that without this CR they cannot send out the veterans benefit checks. It is wrong for us to hold them hostage. It does not matter how much more should be done or what arguments we might make. This needs to be done on behalf of the veterans of this Nation.

It is in fact a legal dispute as to whether or not the President has the authority as a veterans entitlement to send those checks out without us doing a CR. That is a disputed point. Had I been the President, I would have opted in favor of the veteran and said, "Send those checks out, let's do it." In fact the Veterans' Administration has said, "No, we aren't going to do that without Congress authorizing it." Therefore, we have come back with this CR, which is very much needed for the veterans of our country.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 second to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Let me simply respond to the previous speaker by saying nobody objects to opening those functions. You are going to see virtually every single one of us for the opening of those functions. We want you to open more of them. We want you to let all of the Government workers go. We do not want you to continue to hold any hostages.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I was responding to Mr. MOAKLEY's comment that the President has resolved the situation. He has not. This is necessary.

Mr. OBEY. But you said, Mr. Speaker, taking back my time, that we were continuing to try to hold these people hostage. We want you to let them go.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would say again that if veterans are being held hostage, it is not this Congress that is doing it. We have checked with legal experts who say this is a disputed point as to whether or not the President has the authority to order this as a veteran entitlement and have the checks go out on time. He has opted not to do that. We are, therefore, going to solve the problem with this CR so that there is no question those checks will go out in a timely manner.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCI].

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I know that a lot of discussion has gone on in regards to balancing the budget. Everybody is for balancing the budget. Nobody is arguing that point. But what the American people really need to do is ask my colleagues on the other side, "Well, how are you balancing the budget?"

You are cutting Medicare by \$270 billion over 7 years. You are cutting student financial aid by almost \$10 billion over 7 years. You are cutting the Medicaid Program by \$182 billion over 7 years. And you are providing tax breaks to people who are earning over \$100,000; they are going to get a check back for \$8,000 and people who are making under \$30,000 will get a check back for \$127.

That is how you are balancing the budget.

I supported a balanced budget amendment that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] had offered. I had supported Mr. STENHOLM's balanced budget in 7 years. I also supported the Coalition substitute budget for a balance in 7 years. But there were no tax breaks in that proposal.

What the American people need to know beyond the glitz of a balanced budget, for or against, is, "Well, how are you proposing to do it?"

I submit to the members of the American public that when you ask my colleagues on the other side, that is when you notice the questions and the responses will not be as loud as the rhetoric on "I support a balanced budget"—

Mr. HAYWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDACCI. Because what they are proposing to do is they are proposing to increase taxes on working people.

We have an earned income tax credit program where people who are the waiters and waitresses and the cooks and dishwashers who are working and

struggling to stay off assistance are not going to have that earned income tax credit so that they can continue to stay working.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Will the gentleman yield for a question about working people?

Mr. BALDACCI. No, I will not. Thank you very much.

As we talk about moving people off welfare to work, we are taking away the tools from people to go to work.

When you talk about educational opportunities for the young people, when you are talking about the future and the computers and cyberspace, you are cutting student financial aid. There are 30,000 students in my State alone that depend upon guaranteed student financial aid so that they can go—

Mr. HAYWORTH. Will the gentleman yield for a question on financial aid?

Mr. BALDACCI. No. But if the Speaker would tell the gentleman to stop interrupting me, I would appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, could I have order in the House, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The question is correct. The House will be in order.

The gentleman from Maine is entitled to be heard.

The gentleman from Maine may proceed.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, there are 30,000 young people in my State that their only opportunity is a college education. That is their only dream in the world, is to have that college education. But my colleagues on the other side are going to make it more difficult and more expensive for them to go to college.

□ 1030

It is not going to be 4 years to go to college, it is going to be 5 and 6 because they are going to have to work while they are in college. That is what we need to do. That is what we need to address."

So if the President of the United States is going to be blackmailed into supporting a continuing resolution that supports the scheme of balancing the budget on the backs of working people, on the backs of seniors, in my State alone there are people who are struggling for their prescription drugs. The seniors in my State have to cut the prescription drugs up because they cannot afford to take it all at one time.

What we are doing is we are cutting Medicaid because in my State that provides for the prescription drug program. So when you are hearing people on this floor talking about a balanced budget, I support a balanced budget, but I do not support it the way the majority wants to accomplish it.

That is what the President of the United States have been talking about. It hurts the seniors. It hurts the children. I hurts the people who are struggling. That is what this fight is about. This is not about government as usual.

My colleagues on the other side are trying to roll back the environmental

standards. They are trying to roll back the educational opportunities. And they are trying to roll back the standards in nursing homes to protect our seniors.

I would submit to you that the President and the majority on this side are trying to move forward. They are trying to go forward into the future in providing a bright future for all of our young people and all of our seniors because we are not any stronger at all unless we all move forward together. That is what this country was founded on, and those are the responsibilities that we assumed when we swore to the oath as we were new Members of Congress. To allegiance to the country of the United States of America.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like the preceding speaker, he spoke for 5 minutes to go back to the microphone. I would be happy to yield him 5 seconds to say to the American people that he has a balanced budget plan that will balance the budget in 7 years without raising taxes on the American people.

I would also like the gentleman, on his own time, to come back up to the American people while he talks about the 30,000 young people in his State, what about the Federal debt on those young people, what about the deficit this country is facing, what about the \$30 million an hour that this Government spends more than it brings in, spends \$30 million more?

Let me ask the gentleman, what about the child born today who faces \$180,000 on their lifetime earnings just paying interest on the Federal debt? When is the gentleman going to help this country get out of this fiscal insanity? One-seventh of the Federal Government's budget goes to pay interest on the debt. So it is easy, very easy.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Is the gentleman going to yield to me?

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for order in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct. The House will be in order. The gentleman from Colorado has the time and can decide whether or not to yield.

Mr. BALDACCI. The gentleman wanted to ask me a question.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for order in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order. The gentleman from Maine will suspend. The gentleman from Colorado has the time and does not choose to yield.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, this discussion today on the House floor at this point in time is on the rule. The gentleman from Maine decided to utilize this time to go through a 5-minute problem of what we face in this country, but the biggest problem that the gentleman from Maine failed to refer to is the deficit that this country faces.

We have a lot of people, and, frankly, we have people on both sides of the

aisle who are committed, committed, not as a goal but committed to balancing this budget in a 7-year period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Maine rise?

Mr. BALDACCI. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I had thought the gentleman had asked me questions and was going to provide 5 seconds for me to respond.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not state a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BALDACCI. My parliamentary inquiry is, if questions are posed to me, do I have an opportunity to respond to those?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has control of the time. If he chooses not to yield, he does not need to do so.

Mr. BALDACCI. Did you yield me time to respond?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few statements because I asked for time when someone else controlled it, and he was not willing to take on a couple of questions.

One of the preceding speakers talked about an antipathy, an animus toward letting the American people hang on to more of their hard-earned money. He did not degree with the notion of tax cuts. He said this new majority was cutting the earned income tax credit for working Americans, for those lower income Americans.

Mr. Speaker, as you know and as the facts reflect, the earned income tax credit funding increases by some 43 percent.

Then another speaker earlier said that this new majority was intent on cutting student loans. Mr. Speaker, the record reflects that the new majority is offering a \$6 billion increase over the next 7 years in the student loan program.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the rhetoric needs to square with the facts, and when we talk about working people, it is interesting that the President of the United States, in the State of the Union Message, stood at this podium and defined working Americans as those making under \$70,000 a year. I do not know by what barometer work-

ing Americans have to make \$70,000 a year or less. I find it very curious.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, let us be clear about what is going on here. First of all, I would say to the prior speaker with regard to earned income tax credit, the earned income credit has been eliminated for families without children. Now, if you do not call that a cut for those folks, I do not know what you call a cut. So it has been eliminated, eliminated, done, finished, for families who do not have children. There is a cut in the earned income tax credit.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arizona says it is not a cut. Then how come in their budget they count money from the EITC toward balancing the budget? Is that Washington-speak reform?

Ms. DELAURO. Just one more sham.

Let me tell you what this is about. It is not about a balanced budget. That is not what the issue is about today. It is about holding the President of the United States hostage to a set of Republican budget assumptions which say that what we ought to do is to cut \$270 billion in Medicare, throw senior citizens in this country in disarray and provide devastating cuts, increase their premiums, and deny them their choice of doctors. That is what they want to do. They want to cut Medicaid, which allows nursing home coverage. That is one issue, one area that this is about, and holding the President hostage.

The President is right. The President is absolutely right in saying "no" to \$270 billion in Medicare cuts, "no" no to the slashing of education benefits for our young people.

I do not know how all of you got to school. I went to school with student loans. We are about to cut student loans and deny working middle-class families in this country the opportunity to send their kids to school.

They would like to hold the President hostage on those assumptions. The President has said "no" to that. He is right to do it.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to ask a question, and you are talking about the tax cuts of \$270 billion. The gentleman here says that is not a tax cut. But it is strange to me.

What is strange to me under CBO scoring, if you do not get the \$270 billion cuts in Medicare, you cannot have the \$240 billion in tax cuts. So you have got to take it from somebody to give it to somebody else regardless of who you give it to. Whether they make \$10,000 or \$15,000 or \$20,000 or \$30,000 a year, it is a cut.

The bottom line is you are going to cut \$270 billion from the most vulnerable people in this country and you are going to give it away. If you were going to do that, why not put it to the deficit?

Ms. DELAURO. That is a tax break for the wealthiest Americans in this country. That is what this budget is about.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and before I yield time to my colleague down here, I would like to just say, after hearing the preceding speaker, it is kind of, and I will give an example, it is like going to your employer. Let us say you make \$5 an hour and you go to your employer and you say, "I would like a pay raise to \$10." Your employer says, "Well, I am going to raise you \$2. I am going to give a pay raise from \$5 to \$7 an hour." You say, "No. I want \$10." He says, "No. I am going to get you to 7." You go out to your other employee and you say, "Hey, hey, I got a pay cut of \$3 an hour."

We are not cutting Medicare. We are increasing Medicare. We are not cutting student loans. We are increasing student loans.

In regard to that, I will give you specific numbers. I will give you every reason in the book why this President should agree to balance the budget in this country within a 7-year period of time, why this President should agree to this budget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am listening to this debate, and I cannot stand it. I cannot stand when I hear someone say we all want to balance the budget. If we all wanted to balance the budget, the budget would be balanced.

When Members say we all want to balance the budget and then talk about all the cuts they do not want and do not talk where they are willing to make reductions to slow the growth in spending or to cut programs we do not need, I cannot stand it.

We are, in fact, allowing this budget to grow. When I heard Members on that side say we are cutting EITC, the earned income tax credit, it is going from \$19 to \$25.5 billion. Only in this place when you spend more money do people call it a cut.

When they say we are cutting the school lunch program and it is going from \$6.3 to \$7.8 billion, that is an increase, not a cut.

When I hear people particularly say we are cutting the student loan program, it is going from \$24.4 to \$36 billion. It is growing 50 percent. The number of students in the next 5 years is growing from 6.7 million students to 8.4 million students.

Only in this place, in this town, when you spend 50 percent more, do they call it a cut.

Medicaid, it is \$89 billion today. It is growing to \$127 billion. In this town, that is a cut? Only here.

Then, in Medicare, it is going from \$178 to \$289 billion. That is not a cut. It does not even come close to being a cut. That is a significant increase.

Get a life.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is especially important because it seems to me that during this discussion that we should be holding on the rule, that instead we are having some speakers up here who are trying to scare the senior citizens, who are trying to scare students out there about their student loans, who are trying to scare the general population. I think the scariest thing we have got out there is this Federal deficit which is accumulating at a rate of \$30 million an hour.

I think the people in America are prepared to assist us in balancing this budget. I think the people in America understand that we are not cutting programs but that we are reducing the rate of growth there in programs.

I think the people of America want to preserve the economics of this country for the next generation and the next generation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let us get the Government working again. We are not holding the President hostage to tax cut or Medicare cuts. Everything is on the table right now. Everything is on the table.

Medicare is not being cut. It goes up 6.3 percent annually, every year, under this proposal, from \$4,800 a year per beneficiary to \$6,700 a year per beneficiary over a 7-year period.

But if you do not like our plan, let us see your plan to balance the budget. If you do not like the tax cuts, let us do it without the tax cut, but let us work together. Work to balance the budget in 7 years, and let us get the CBO to score it. It has been nonpartisan for year.

Let us send the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill up the President and get 100,000 more people working again. We can do this today. We can have these people back to work by Monday.

The District of Columbia Government should not be shut down because of our inability to get this signed by the President.

We ought to do something for them and get them back with their own money. We should not hold them hostage. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves. Let us pass this rule. Let us move ahead.

□ 1045

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, let me say, my colleague from Virginia is right. There is a reason why we are in session today, and there is a reason why the Government is shut down, and it has a lot to do with the new majority that my freshman colleagues from the other side of the aisle talk about.

Here are the facts. First of all, this Congress, controlled by the Republican majority in both Houses, has only passed 4 of 13 appropriations bills. Those are the bills that are supposed to be passed by October 1. Had those bills been passed, sent to the White House, and signed into law, almost 2 months ago, we would not be doing this today. We would not be talking about a shut-down of Government. Because this is how Government is shut down. They are funded through the appropriations bills.

Second, the Republicans are holding up the continuing resolution. In fact, the continuing resolution that was adopted by this House the other day that we hear so much about, to my knowledge, is still sitting in the Senate and has not even been sent to the President for him to either sign or veto as he should choose.

The fact is the reason why you cannot pass a clean CR is because you want to put a 7-year requirement. We can sit down, like my colleague from Virginia said, and talk about whether we want to get to a 7-year balanced budget. I voted for one. There are differences. But it has nothing to do with the CR. What it has to do with is the bill that this House adopted yesterday, the reconciliation bill.

So why are you trying to put it in this bill when you have adopted another bill to do it? Is it because you are holding the Government hostage? Is it because it is either your way or no way?

Yes, that is what it is. It has nothing to do with appropriations. So you are muddling up an appropriations bill with what should be in a reconciliation bill. The facts are very, very clear.

Now, there is a bipartisan way to get there. Quite frankly, I do not think the new Republican majority wants to do it. They are in a bind. They are in a bind because they do not have the votes to pass their version. They do not want any other version. They want a version that cuts \$270 billion out of Medicare, \$140 out of Medicaid, and gives a \$245 billion tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, that is the problem and that is why we are here.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I think the gentleman's inquiries deserve some type of response.

First of all, the question is why does the continuing resolution have such an onerous requirement that the President of the United States ought to commit to balancing the budget of the country within a 7-year period of time? I would suggest that the gentleman look at the TV commercial right now going on on at least five or eight different times. The President of this

country has on each of those different occasions given a commitment, commitment, to the American people to balance the budget. The first time was when he was running for office, 5 years, then it went to 10 years, then back to 7 years, then to 8 years, and who knows what.

All we are asking for is a commitment in writing. Talk is cheap. The American people want a commitment in writing from us, which we just gave on the continuing resolution, and I say proudly it was bipartisan; 48 Democrats joined us in that. We gave our word in writing to this country we will balance the budget in 7 years.

I think it is fair, and I think it is appropriate, that we ask the President of the United States to give his commitment in writing that this country will have a budget balanced, not as a goal but as a commitment, within a 7-year period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT].

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, briefly I would like to say that we have been doing our job here. We voted about 800 times last year; the entire Congress only voted 507 times. By trying to work with the President, we have been wasting our time, and that is why we have not been successful in getting our appropriations bills through.

We see the confusion of the American people when people talk about cuts in Medicare. When it goes from \$4,800 to \$6,700, that is not a cut. We are not balancing the budget on the backs of working people or senior citizens. That is what the Clinton tax burden did in 1993. It increased taxes on the working people through the gas tax and the poor. That is who pays the most for gas taxes. It increases taxes on Social Security. Mr. President did that.

But what we are trying to do here is relieve some of that burden. We are trying to reduce taxes on working people, on people with children, and we are also trying to preserve and protect Medicare. But the real fundamental issue here is can you balance the budget in 7 years.

We are tired of the dance. The music is playing. Let us dance to the music. The American public wants a balanced budget. I think this has been playing on for such a long time we are going to hear it over and over again. The real issue here is are you going to balance the budget in 7 years.

Now, there has been talk about a little leverage, play room, maybe not quite 7 years. For 26 years we have been hearing this about we cannot quite do it this time, we are going to have to do it some other way, we are going to have to wait awhile. The American people want us to draw a finite line, say we are going to balance the budget, and 7 years is an optimal time. It is the time when we can do it with the least amount of discomfort.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIAHRT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman complaining a while ago about the tax increases of 1993. Would you believe that none of those taxes are repealed in your tax bill this year. Not a single one. I do not know what you are bellyaching about.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, what we are trying to do here is relieve people who have children, relieve seniors, trying to get them back to work, become actively involved. The President has failed to balance the budget in 7 years. He has even failed to agree to it. I support the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing roughly the same debate and good speeches now on both sides of the aisle for about 11 months. Where are we today, on a Saturday, about 45 days after we should have had a budget for the American people?

Well, we have the government shut down; we have hard working people throughout America that have saved all year long that are going on vacations, and the parks are closing; we have people working hard in my district making the HMMWV, one of the best Jeep vehicles for the military, and because the defense contracting agencies are shut down, they may start to be laid off next week.

Mr. Speaker, I think the American people are sending us the message that it is time for us to open the government up and to sit down and negotiate, to negotiate, and not talk about Air Force One, and who played hearts for how long, or what person was told to get off what exit of Air Force One.

Mr. Speaker, let us get off of personalities and get on to negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON], a Republican from Michigan, and I have language to try to get this government moving in the right direction again. We have 90 Republicans and Democrats that are trying to move forward on a CR that will give us some negotiating room to get this government open again in a bipartisan way.

If the leadership will not talk to each other, maybe it takes the grassroots here to get government moving in the right direction again. But I think the American people are losing their patience for a government and a Congress that will not work together to solve the Nation's biggest problem, and that is trying to balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to begin to work together in a bipartisan way. If Mr. Rabin could have talked to Mr. Arafat one year ago, I think that Republicans and Democrats can talk to each other in Washington, DC.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, you know, speech after speech today from the Democrat Party has one central theme: Not that of balancing the budget, but a theme of fear. Scare your grandmother, scare your child, scare your fellow Democrat; that if this fear mongering does not work, we will not be reelected.

Now, let us examine the low income housing credit which they claim to be champions of on behalf of the poor. What do they really use it for?

Now, Democrats, I want you all to watch this, because I think it might make you squirm a little bit in shame. Here is what you know you are doing on franked, taxpayer expenses. You send out this letter. And it says, and this is shocking to me, "Put some extra money in your pocket with the earned income tax credit. You may be eligible for as much as \$2,258 a year back. Come clean, your money."

Then it goes on, "Even if you do not owe income taxes, you can get EIC."

I want to ask you Democrats, how many of you do not do this? Raise your hand.

Very few hands go up on the Democrat side. That is very interesting to me, very interesting. And I appreciate the honesty of the fact that only three or four of you are not doing this.

I would like us to say if we do restore the earned income tax credit, I would love your side to take a pledge that you will not be sending out such a shameless flyer on taxpayer expense. If you would take this pledge not to abuse the franking privilege in this way—

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, I guess I got your attention, and I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Are you saying every Democrat sent that out? I did not send it out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman from Florida will suspend. The gentleman from Georgia has the time. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me repeat, I asked the Democrats who were not doing this to raise their hands. Not many hands were raised.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia will suspend. The House will be in order. The House can conduct its business with better decorum than that. The gentleman from Georgia will suspend until the House is in order. The gentleman from North Carolina will suspend until the House is in order. The gentleman from Georgia has the floor.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I will be glad to yield for a quick question to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Well, you know, sending out these flyers, what you have done, you have let the people who are going to get the big tax breaks sit in on the committee markups. Which is the worse?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, my question was simple. How many of you all do this at taxpayer expense, and how many of you will pledge to stop doing it? That is all my question is. I think this is an abuse of the franking privilege. You can read that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have already gone over it. But I say it is time we stop this.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised not to conduct straw polls in the House.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BONO].

(Mr. BONO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BONO. Mr. Speaker, you know, I came here because I did not understand all this rhetoric that is going on. I still do not understand it. For one, you hear about education, "the backs of education." The very truth of the matter is simple: Education in this country stinks. It is that simple. Now, I do not understand why we would pour more money at a lousy educational system and get the results that we are getting. But we are saying we are taking education away.

We are not. I cannot send my kids to a public school. It is so lousy, I would not dare abuse my children. So that is just a bunch of nonsense. Education, they had better reform it. So we are not doing anything on the backs of education.

Now, see, as an average guy, I would say, why did the President come up here and why did I sit here and hear him say "Let's use CBO numbers?"

□ 1100

Why did he say that? Has anyone said why he said that? Why did he say use CBO numbers? I do not understand. He said that. I guess the kindest thing to say is he was not telling the truth when he said that.

Look, my colleagues, here is the issue. We have to balance this budget. Otherwise, we hit a wall going 180 miles an hour. It is not as complicated as all this rhetoric that we hear by these expert politicians. It is we must balance the budget.

Now, if they wanted to balance the budget, they had 40 years to balance the budget. We are now confronting that issue. We cannot back down from that.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a report on time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] has 12 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was in my office this morning watching the proceedings of the House, and it brought to mind a movie which I liked very much, called "Groundhog Day" with Bill Murray. Every time the clock radio went off in that movie, on would come the former speaker, Congressman BONO, singing "I Got You, Babe." No matter what morning came along, every morning the same song was playing on the clock radio.

That is what is going on on the House floor here. It strikes me that the political rhetoric in this debate is getting repetitive, tired, and sad. Members are getting short-tempered because we are making no progress whatsoever. The Republicans insist they are saving America. We Democrats think they are saving America. Speaker GINGRICH thinks the idea of a 7-year balanced budget came to him in a dream. We think it could turn out to be an economic nightmare.

Frankly, what is in store for us here is to finally put aside some of this hot rhetoric, sit down, Democrats and Republicans, President and congressional leaders, and get this mess resolved.

Were we not sent to Washington to solve problems? I think we were. What we see here is a lot of pettiness, a lot of vitriol, and, frankly, very little progress.

The saddest part of it all is that there are some real victims in this political debate. Seven hundred thousand Federal employees as of Monday will still be on the streets without pay; 700,000 people being held hostage to this kind of political debate. That is outrageous.

It is nothing short of outrageous as well that while these people are on the streets without pay Members of Congress will still get their paychecks. How can we send these people home without pay while Members of Congress still get paid?

That is why I have introduced no budget, no pay. It says to Members of Congress, if we are serious about turning people out on the streets without a paycheck, cut off the machine that writes our paychecks. And Members know what will happen. We will not take this 48-hour adjournment recess the Republicans have proposed. We will stay here and do the job as we should. Get it done.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to the gentleman there is nothing that prevents him from going ahead and doing the pilot project and not taking his check.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINNIS. No; I will not.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINNIS. Regular order of the House, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order. The gentleman from Colorado has the time, and he can choose whether or not to yield. He does not choose to yield.

The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, the second thing I would ask the preceding speaker is to amend his bill so that it includes the President of the United States; and the third thing that I would mention to the previous speaker is he talks about 700,000 Federal employees, and my bet is that these people will, while they are furloughed, they will be paid for that period of time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will suspend. The Members are advised that the time used by the floor manager in commenting on the substance of the debate is counted against his time.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado may proceed.

Mr. MCINNIS. Again, Mr. Speaker, to the previous speaker, the gentleman talks about 700,000 so-called hostages, Federal employees who will be paid while they are on this furlough, but he continually, every day that there is a speech by the gentleman, he continually fails to mention that 230 or 260 million people in this country are held hostage by the deficit, which is accumulating at \$30 million an hour.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, we are really here to end the sham, the scam. If Members will recall when Bill Clinton, before he was President, I saw him with my own eyes. I have a little bit of nearsightedness, but I saw him, I heard him. I am not visually or hearing impaired, and I heard him. He was running for office, and he promised to balance the budget in 5 years. We heard him.

Now, I am sure you have seen the recent commercial. We also have Bill Clinton saying, I think it can be done. Well, it can. First of all, it can be done in 7 years. That is May 1995. Then we heard 10 years, then we heard 9 years and 8 years. . . .

Mr. HOYER. Objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MICA. We are going to nail down the balanced budget.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman's words be taken down.

Mr. MCINNIS. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. Under the rules, the gentleman cannot say any more.